```
M6dWsch1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
1
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 4
                                              17 Cr. 548 (JMF)
                 V.
5
     JOSHUA ADAM SCHULTE,
6
                     Defendant.
                                              Trial
 7
           -----x
 8
                                              New York, N.Y.
                                              June 13, 2022
9
                                              10:15 a.m.
10
     Before:
11
                           HON. JESSE M. FURMAN,
12
                                              District Judge
13
                                APPEARANCES
14
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
15
          United States Attorney for the
           Southern District of New York
     BY: DAVID W. DENTON JR.
16
          MICHAEL D. LOCKARD
17
          Assistant United States Attorneys
18
      JOSHUA A. SCHULTE, Defendant Pro Se
19
20
      SABRINA P. SHROFF
21
     DEBORAH A. COLSON
           Standby Attorneys for Defendant
22
     Also Present: Charlotte Cooper, Paralegal Specialist
23
24
25
```

THE COURT: We've already appeared in the classified setting, but since this is the beginning of our public setting today, in the matter of United States v. Schulte, 17 Cr. 548, counsel, would you state your appearances for the record, and Mr. Schulte.

MR. DENTON: Good morning, your Honor. David Denton and Michael Lockard for the government, and with us is Paralegal Charlotte Cooper.

THE COURT: Good morning to you.

Mr. Schulte.

MR. SCHULTE: Josh Schulte, appearing pro se.

MS. SHROFF: Good morning, your Honor. Standby counsel Deborah Colson and Sabrina Shroff.

THE COURT: All right. Good morning.

We have a few things to cover before we bring the jury pool up here.

One thing you'll notice is that Ms. Smallman is not here. Unfortunately, I anticipate that that will be true for the next five to ten days -- you can probably figure out what the situation is there -- but we will have to make do. It will make things a little bit more complicated, but thankfully, Mr. Lee here has agreed to step in, at least for today and maybe the coming next few days. I don't think he is cleared, so keep that in mind if there are any issues of that sort.

In terms of covering things that need to be addressed

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

here, first, Mr. Schulte's letter on Friday requesting an adjournment after jury selection, that request is denied. First, the fact that Mr. Schulte did not anticipate how hard it is to prepare for trial, let alone how hard it is for a pro se litigant, is obviously not a basis for adjournment. He was warned about the drawbacks of proceeding pro se and chose to go pro se notwithstanding those, and the fact that trials are hard to prepare for is not a reason to grant an adjournment trial, nor is the fact that he assumed incorrectly what order the government would call its witnesses in this trial. happens in all sorts of trials, and if anything, he just had more information going into this trial than most litigants do going into trial. And finally, I had previously denied the request for an adjournment based on the laptop and medication issues, and nothing Mr. Schulte said in his letter Friday persuades me that that requires reconsideration.

That would be enough to deny the application, but for the sake of the record, I feel compelled to say a few other things.

First, Mr. Schulte has known about this trial date and that it was a firm date for over six months, since it was set on December 6, 2021. Moreover, I initially set an earlier date but granted his request to delay it by approximately a month not based on the need to prepare but based on the availability of his expert.

Second, I have gone through what I can only describe as extraordinary lengths to ensure that Mr. Schulte has what he needs to prepare for trial and really above and beyond what the law entitles him to. I arranged for him to have more SCIF time, more time in the Sand law library, and so on. As you know, I've regularly communicated both with the MDC directly and the United States Marshal, something that I have done in no other case to date, and I have basically gone to extreme lengths to ensure that most of his requests are granted, subject to some policy issues and security-type issues. But the bottom line is I have done what I can to ensure that he is able to prepare for trial.

Third, the supposed problems at the MDC would weigh more heavily in the balance if Mr. Schulte hadn't been complaining on a regular basis about such things. First, that record and what I've heard from the MDC casts some doubt on Mr. Schulte's claims, but more importantly, even if they are accurate, to the extent there have been such problems, Mr. Schulte has long been on notice to make the best use of his time and ensure that he doesn't leave his preparations to the last minute, given the possibility of such problems. And finally, and perhaps most importantly, Mr. Schulte has not made the best use of his time. Since I was reassigned this case, Mr. Schulte has filed a staggering number of motions and other applications. By my rough count or my law clerk's rough count,

close to 100 motions have been filed since I got this case last fall and that I don't even think includes relatively minor requests. The vast majority of those motions were filed by Mr. Schulte, and while some of them raised colorable, if not significant, issues, most did not. Indeed, many — I did not try to count — simply reraised arguments that had been considered and rejected by one or both of Judge Crotty and me. After that, Mr. Schulte's 17-some-odd appeals that he has filed, notwithstanding the lack of a final judgment, which, by the way, is why I have continued to proceed despite those appeals and the 15 or so civil cases that Mr. Schulte has filed in this district alone, it is little wonder that Mr. Schulte has not had enough time to finish his preparations for trial.

To be clear, I'm not faulting, let alone punishing, Mr. Schulte for availing himself of the Court to seek appropriate relief. Candidly, his litigation strategy writ large has bordered on abuse of the court system. My point is simply having made the choice to spend his finite time in the manner in which he has that he has to live with the consequences of those choices. So bottom line is we have had this trial date for six-plus months. It is a firm date. Once we have a jury, we will proceed expeditiously, and the request for a two-day adjournment after we have a jury is denied.

Second, just to make a record, I did communicate with the MDC last week concerning some of the issues that

Mr. Schulte has raised. I was assured at least on the weekdays last week that the computer in the Sand library was up and running and had been checked. I was also told that Mr. Schulte was provided with a grooming kit, and he appears indeed to have groomed himself today. So I assume that that is accurate. He also did receive, obviously, civilian clothing, since he is dressed accordingly today.

Mr. Schulte, one note, at times, your mask has dipped below your nose and I have not necessarily called you on it or enforced it, but I would encourage you to ensure that it doesn't going forward. I don't think you want the jury to think that you're not abiding by the rules, and I don't want to call you out in front of the jury. So if you can just make sure you have your mask up, that would be great.

I did speak to the U.S. Marshal as well and, on that front, would say a few things. One, I was told that the marshals would allow Mr. Schulte to keep his papers and laptop during breaks and in the mornings when he gets to the courthouse. So that request has been granted. I think there were a few other issues there, all of which, I think all those requests have been granted as well. But I guess the few things that I want to discuss is the approaching of witnesses and approaching of sidebars.

Mr. Schulte's request for permission to approach the witness, I'm going to deny that. Again, I think to the extent

that we can figure out procedures so that nobody really needs to approach the witness, that would be ideal. If that means putting binders on the witness box at the start of the witness's testimony with their 3500 so that we can simply direct them to things, that would be ideal. In any event, if anyone needs to approach, I'll let standby counsel approach on Mr. Schulte's behalf. So he should just request permission for standby counsel to approach, and standby counsel can do that for him. But given the security issues involved and the witnesses going before the jury, and so on and so forth, that request is denied, and I think we can come up with an adequate substitute.

By contrast, at my urging, the marshals have OKed Mr. Schulte attending sidebars. He will be accompanied by a U.S. Marshal, obviously dressed in civilian clothes. I would request that one standby counsel and one of the marshals approach with Mr. Schulte. I think given the number of people who would be at sidebar, they will simply blend in and there wouldn't be any issues on that score. But with that proviso, Mr. Schulte will be permitted to approach for sidebars.

Obviously, Mr. Schulte, if there are any issues whatsoever, that permission will not only be revoked, but it may have other consequences. So I'm trusting, given that you have been on best behavior, in my presence, at least, that there will be no issues -- security issues or threat issues --

but suffice it to say I will swiftly deal with any problems of that sort, so I trust that there won't be any.

On Friday, the parties conveyed to me that they had reached agreement on witness-related issues, at least as concerned the witnesses that the government had been most concerned about.

Any reason to put anything on the record about that other than the fact of the agreement?

MR. DENTON: Your Honor, I would say we've reached an agreement with respect to the category of witnesses the government identified as most sensitive.

Standby counsel conveyed that they would be working with the defendant to narrow that list. We were advised this morning that that has been done. After the classified conference, we asked standby counsel to provide us with that narrowed list. Ms. Shroff said she would get to it if the Court issues an order to that effect, so we would ask that the Court order the defendant to convey his narrowed request to the government so that we can start letting people know.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Schulte or Ms. Shroff.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, I haven't been able to speak to Mr. Schulte in the SCIF today, so I haven't been able to narrow anything since Friday. We told them we would work on it, and we are. And by the end of the day, we hopefully we

have narrowed it. If I had the narrower lift now, I would give it to them.

THE COURT: Great. As soon as you do, please give it to them, and if there are any issues that I need to resolve, then you'll let me know.

I had a few other things on my list of items to raise, but I don't think they'll take more than a few minutes. So for that reason, unless the parties have any concerns with my doing so, I would probably let the jury department know that they can begin to assemble the jurors and send them up.

Anything?

MR. DENTON: Just logistically, your Honor, with respect to challenges for cause, before we get to that, does the Court intend to do that at sidebar, or mechanically, how would the Court like to proceed?

THE COURT: For the most part, I will call 36 jurors by name based on the randomized list that we'll get from the jury department. 18 of them will be in the jury box. The other 18 will be in the front rows back there. I will proceed, beginning with juror No. 1 and go through, and frankly, most people who should be excused for cause I will simply excuse because it will be obvious to me. At various junctures during the process, I would anticipate giving you guys an opportunity either to make additional applications of that sort or requests to follow up with jurors of that sort. That will either be

done during a break, when no one is here, or it will be done at sidebar.

MR. DENTON: That's fine, your Honor. We'll wait for the invitations.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Schulte, any questions about that?

MR. SCHULTE: I don't think so.

I just wanted to raise or discuss a couple of logistic issues with -- that you had mentioned before -- the marshals and MDC.

THE COURT: All right. But before you do that, why don't we just let the jury department know that we will be ready whenever folks are sent up so we can get started.

MR. SCHULTE: OK.

THE COURT: I'm going to ask before the jurors come up that anyone up here, if you could move to the far back of the courtroom, to please make room for the jury pool in the front, I'd be grateful.

Second, to keep going down my list, I mentioned this in the classified hearing but said I would reiterate it here to make a record. I have granted the government's motion to admit Government Exhibit 1 and whatever number exhibit the log files are, the two exhibits the government sought so introduce as classified exhibits at trial. I am granting that motion both under Section 8 of CIPA, and I find, based on my evaluation of

the Lawlor factors, that that proposal is adequate or justified as a limited courtroom closure. I will issue an opinion on that issue in due course.

There is one remaining issue with respect to the defense use of some classified information that remains unresolved, and I think I'll want resolution on that before I issue an opinion, since I may have to address that as well, but the government has to report back to me on that score in short order.

There were some issues raised by Mr. Schulte concerning stipulations. This is Dkt. No. 854. I've already ruled with respect to the stipulations that were admitted in the first trial; to the extent that they were admitted at the first trial, they're admissible here. It would definitely be better if Mr. Schulte signed new versions of them that omitted any reference to his lawyers, but if he's not willing or able to do that, then the burden is on the government to propose some sort of appropriate substitute. But Mr. Schulte raised in that letter that there were some issues.

I want to be clear. That is a separate issue from any stipulations that Mr. Schulte is proposing. I'm certainly happy to discuss those, but at the end of the day, the government's not required to stipulate to things, particularly if it doesn't agree with what is set forth in the stipulation. And if the government doesn't stipulate, Mr. Schulte is going

to have to call whatever witnesses he thinks are appropriate to address those issues.

Mr. Denton, where do the stipulations stand?

MR. DENTON: Your Honor, I think we let Mr. Schulte know that we also view them as separate issues. We do have redacted versions that are available of the old stipulations, if necessary, but we are hoping that he will sign the new ones today.

With respect to his stipulations, I think there are a number of them that we're in agreement on and will be able to finalize. However, there are a number of them that proposed offering a significant number of exhibits that the government believes would be inadmissible, like thousands of instant message chats between FBI agents who are testifying witnesses or the defendant's own statements. And so I think, you know, insofar as the defendant is asking us to stipulate to authenticity, we may have, either in writing or at a conference, some practice before the Court in limine on whether those are going to be admissible before we can reach stipulations on them.

THE COURT: OK. A couple of suggestions.

First of all, Mr. Schulte, I do think these are separate issues, and again, I think the cleanest and best way to handle the prior stipulations is to sign new ones, reserving your rights to challenge my prior ruling on that front, and I

would order to you that sooner rather than later. Otherwise, some redacted versions of the prior stipulations will be admitted.

As for your proposed stipulations, I guess I would just ask that you guys work those things out sooner rather than later so that Mr. Schulte knows if there are witnesses that he needs to subpoena or call, that he has adequate amount of time to do that. And second, Mr. Denton, to the extent that you have issues with respect to relevance or admissibility that are separate from authenticity, I would urge you to at least stipulate as to authenticity so that Mr. Schulte knows he doesn't need to call a custodian or witness to testify to authenticity, and then we can litigate questions of admissibility and relevance and the sort. But to the extent that Mr. Schulte needs adequate time to know what witnesses, custodians he needs to call, I think it's fair to ask that you sort these things out sooner rather than later.

Does that make sense?

MR. DENTON: Yes, your Honor.

I think that with the exception of the Michael memo that we talked about, we're not going to need any custodians on any of the more ministerial things in this case.

THE COURT: All right. But I want you to let him know sooner rather than later so that he can use his time wisely.

Mr. Schulte, any questions on that?

MR. SCHULTE: No. I mean I think I spoke with the government earlier, and they have already responded to my stipulations. I think, you know, we're — like he said, we're in agreement on many things, and some things are just related to authenticity versus admissibility, and I think we're essentially finished with that. So I'm hoping by the end of the day to have all that finished. And there shouldn't be an issue.

THE COURT: Great. Bottom line is you guys should try and sort these things out. To the extent that you need to raise issues with me, either disputes over stipulations or, more to the point, the admissibility of evidence relating to the stipulations, it's up to you to raise those in a timely fashion.

One minor note. We have plenty of time on this, but since it's on my list of things to mention, we've already discussed at the final pretrial conference Mr. Schulte's testimony if he elects to testify, that that will be done in some sort of Q&A, where he drafts the questions for standby counsel. My summer intern actually helpfully raised the question of how to handle objections if Mr. Schulte has objections to questions that are posed on cross or to respond to objections that the government raises on direct, so I thank her for that.

The short answer is that Mr. Schulte is representing

himself, so he will raise objections and respond to objections notwithstanding the fact that he's in the witness box. So that's how we will handle that.

Mr. Schulte, that covers my list. You had said that you had one or two things as well.

MR. SCHULTE: Yeah. So, I mean the first thing is I just wanted to put on the record that, you know, I object to that. I think it's going to be very prejudicial if, and not feasible if I'm testifying and having to deal with the objections.

And then there's one other thing I wanted to put on the record too. The 3500 materials the government provided very late on Friday that were dated 5/25, standby counsel asked twice for these materials. I haven't yet been able to review them because they came in so late. So those two things I just wanted to put on the record first.

And then my only -- I had two questions. One of the marshals, one of the issues was transport. I've heard, you know, different things from the marshals. I just want clarification. Some said that it shouldn't be an issue to have my legal work with me. Sometimes we sit in front of MDC for three or four hours. It would be nice to be able to actually work on the case on the laptop. So I'm not sure what -- like I said, I've heard a couple different things, so I just wanted to get, try and get clarification on that issue.

And then the MDC, I was trying to see if the Court could help me either get an order or something that before I leave in the morning I'm able to connect my laptop and print some documents, since I don't have access to the printer directly from my cell, when I'm working on things, updating my cross. I know that the Court has said to have paper copies available as well as electronics, so I don't have any way to print that except if I'm leaving in the morning, but the MDC don't allow me to use the printer when I'm coming in the morning. So I'm just hoping to resolve this so that I am able to have paper copies of things as well, updated paper copies as well as electronic copies.

THE COURT: All right. I'll get in touch with both MDC and the marshal on those. Those seem like reasonable requests, subject to any policy or security issues that I may be unaware of. I'll see if those can be honored.

With respect to your objection or concern about your testimony and the objections, I understand, but given that you are representing yourself, I think it's important to draw the line between those things and make clear to the jury that you're handling your own defense, and I think that's the best way to handle it. Again, recognizing my discretion in these matter, your concerns are overruled or objections are overruled.

With respect to 3500, I'm not sure there was an

application made. Obviously, the government, I presume, complied with its deadline with respect to what was in its possession. It is always the case in trials that there are additional materials that are produced on a rolling basis as the government comes into possession of them.

Mr. Denton, do you want to address that in any way?
MR. DENTON: Yes, your Honor.

There were a set of notes taken during the interim between when we made the 3500 production and now, and we provided them to the defendant on Friday.

THE COURT: All right. To the extent that the deadline to produce 3500 was several weeks ago, that's a long window. Is there a reason that you waited until Friday?

MR. DENTON: Some of them we had to obtain. I don't think there was a particular reason, your Honor. I think we were just providing them in a collated set. It wasn't a large amount of material.

THE COURT: All right. Well, given that the vast majority was produced well before trial and indeed that this is the second trial, it doesn't strike me that that's an issue that requires relief, but so be it. I don't know if there's a specific application. I will certainly remind the government of its obligations to produce these things in a timely fashion to avoid the need for any continuance or adjournment, but at the moment there's no such request.

Mr. Schulte.

MR. SCHULTE: Yes. I guess I'm just putting it on the record and asking, you know, next -- you know, for the government to be more expeditious if it encounters more material.

THE COURT: All right. I just asked the government to do that myself, so I think they've gotten the message.

My deputy, who is not here but nevertheless is handling some things from afar, advises that the press has requested a feed to the press room. I think that that was OK, given the precautions that will be in place for the three witnesses; it's audio only.

Are there any issues on that score?

MR. DENTON: I think that was done last time, your Honor, but to the extent that it's already being sent to an overflow room, I don't think there's any issue with it being sent to the press as well.

THE COURT: All right. Agreed. I think it's just a matter of location, and I don't think they would be privy to anything that a member of the public wouldn't be privy to or they wouldn't be privy to if they were here or in the overflow room.

Mr. Denton, do you know when you would anticipate the witness testifying this week who would be subject to the most extreme precautions?

MR. DENTON: It is possible that he would take the stand at the very end of the day tomorrow. I think it is more likely that he will be on Wednesday.

THE COURT: OK. Anything else from either side before we commence jury selection in a few minutes?

MR. DENTON: Not from the government, your Honor.

MR. SCHULTE: No, I don't think so.

THE COURT: All right.

Looking at one final note that I forgot to mention, I did request -- and I gather this was done, but I haven't seen it yet -- that the podium be moved back a few feet in courtroom 15A so that, No. 1, no juror can see what's on the screen and, No. 2, Mr. Schulte can more easily go back and forth between the defense table and the podium. So I just wanted to mention that.

All right. I will await the jury pool, and we'll get started when they get up here.

MR. DENTON: If I may, your Honor, while we're waiting?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. DENTON: With respect to the podium, will we be able to center it for purposes of opening statements and then move it back, or is it fixed and the marshals want it to remain where it is?

THE COURT: It's fixed. That's less to do with the

marshals than it is to do with the fact that it's wired and connected to all sorts of things.

I actually don't know if in 15A there's a global podium that can be moved to be in front of the jury box as there is in some courtrooms. I can check on it, but I guess unless and until I say otherwise, you should assume that you'll have to address the jury from the fixed podium.

MR. DENTON: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: It's not ideal, but it's better than the Covid courtrooms.

MR. DENTON: That's certainly true.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SHROFF: Your Honor, may Mr. Schulte just consult with Mr. Fisher for five minutes before the jury comes? He just has a question, and Mr. Fisher was on the first trial too. He's from the Federal Defenders.

THE COURT: He can talk for a couple of minutes, but when the jury is here, we're going to get going.

MS. SHROFF: Of course. Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Counsel, please take your seats.

(Continued on next page)

THE COURT: You may be seated. It appears that all the prospective jurors have left the courtroom.

So let's discuss first jury selection. We have at present, by my count, 34 qualified jurors. We need to fill seat 19 first thing tomorrow and then resume with 36. We have gone through 65 jurors so we have only five. Assuming they're all here and remaining in the pool I will keep my fingers crossed that we don't need to go through any extra.

Yes, Mr. Schulte? Microphone, please.

MR. SCHULTE: 33 we never finished questioning.

THE COURT: You are correct -- no, not correct about that. I think we did. She is the woman who came up at the end.

MR. SCHULTE: We didn't go through the personal questions list.

THE COURT: You are totally correct about that. Thank you for pointing that out. So we will need to do that tomorrow. But since that's not a function of qualifying I will treat her as a qualified juror. But, thank you for reminding me.

So again, I think we have 34 qualified, we need to fill 19 and 36. Hopefully the remaining jurors will let us do that. If not, we will get some extra jurors and start over but let's hope that doesn't come to that.

Anything to discuss on that front? Any follow up on

24

25

any of the 34? Any related motions to strike anything 1 2 jury-selection related. 3 Mr. Denton? 4 MR. DENTON: Not with respect to jury selection, your 5 Honor. THE COURT: Mr. Schulte, anything else relating to 6 7 jury selection? MR. SCHULTE: Just one second? 8 9 (pause) 10 MR. SCHULTE: No, we do not have anything. 11 THE COURT: Anything unrelated to jury selection, 12 Mr. Denton? 13 MR. DENTON: Yes, your Honor. 14 We just wanted to flag something for the Court that we 15 expect will come up at various points. As we just saw and has 16 happened frequently --17 THE COURT: Will you use the microphone a little better? 18 19 MR. DENTON: Is that better? 20 THE COURT: Yes. 21 MR. DENTON: We frequently had instances in which 22 there have been pauses for the defendant to confer with standby 23 counsel, sometimes audibly. We have taken a look and just wand

to be mindful of the admonitions in McAskill about not undermining the appearance that the defendant is directing his

own defense. It seems like the law on that really focuses on the unsolicited activities of standby counsel but defendant can direct his defense and his team however he wants. So we just wanted to flag, I expect that there may come points where outside of the presence of the jury we just ask the Court to allocute the defendant about his satisfaction with the role being played by standby counsel and the fact that their input is solicited and desired by him, just to protect that record down the road.

THE COURT: There are two separate issues here, one is the Mr. Schulte on his defense. First, standby counsel is accurately involved but from my observation it would appear that is with Mr. Schulte's consent and invitation and in that regard is not inconsistent with him controlling his defense. It is pretty clear to me based on the flood of filings and other such things that Mr. Schulte is driving the boat here. But I certainly have no objection, I am sure Mr. Schulte doesn't, to just confirm every once in a while that that is in fact the case.

There is a separate issue which is the audibility of any consultation. Candidly, Ms. Shroff in particular, at times during pretrial conferences that has been whispering things or not so much communicating things to Mr. Schulte that even I have been able to hear it at a distance. I have largely ignored that and allowed it even though at times I think it has

made the court reporter's job more difficult but I do want to underscore that in front of the jury that can't happen.

Obviously, any communications from either side within the trial teams can't be audible to the jury because that's not appropriate for them to hear so I trust that everybody will understand and adhere to that and make sure that their communications are genuine whispers even with the masks so that the jury can't overhear anything that they shouldn't overhear.

With respect to the first issue, Mr. Schulte, again, it is my observation that you are actively availing yourself of standby counsel's advice but is it fair to say that you agree that you are running the ship and controlling your own defense and that their advice is solicited rather than unsolicited?

MR. SCHULTE: Yes, that's correct; especially for the jury selection, I really need their assistance. I have actively requested a lot of assistance in being able to -- they have lots of experience and I want to be able to use that experience so I have been -- everything going on is me requesting assistance in picking jurors and things of that nature.

THE COURT: Very good.

Mr. Denton, anything else on that or otherwise?

MR. DENTON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: To the extent that we can discuss it in this setting, anything that you can share -- I know you have

been in the courtroom most of the day but any developments on the 6(c) front that we might be able to share?

MR. DENTON: Only to say that as of our one break the wheels were actively turning. I don't know where that's gotten us to in the last four hours but we will find out and try and keep the wheels turning.

THE COURT: Very good.

Mr. Schulte, anything else unrelated to jury selection from you?

MR. SCHULTE: Yes. Just a couple things.

Before I asked for like a kind of dress rehearsal for how these things would go, but anticipating tomorrow most likely the direct and first cross will occur and whenever I anticipate doing my cross-examination I would anticipate using the laptop to bring up the exhibits and so we are just kind of working out how exactly that's going to work.

We have a cable over here and we are in contact with someone trying to get another cable, but unless the Court is aware, this computer or the computer at the podium is also used for putting the exhibits on or how does the Court anticipate if I can just use my own laptop to connect to display the exhibits, if that's acceptable? I just want to work all of this out now before there is any issues.

THE COURT: First of all, I was in contact with the marshal last week and he told me that -- I had made the request

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

that you be produced to 15(a) at 4:00 to do a run-through. Did that not happen?

MR. SCHULTE: No. That never happened.

THE COURT: OK. Sorry to hear that. I don't know if that was a marshal issue or separate issue. I know you were trying to get various things done that day. The short answer is I don't involve myself in those things but it is up to the parties to do it. But, in general, the computers connect with the system through wiring at counsel table. And the monitor -first of all, we are not in this courtroom for trial, it is 15A, but to say in general, set up there the monitor on the podium is a display monitor and usually someone at counsel table controls the computer and calls up whatever it is the person conducting the examination wants to call up and then it is displayed on the monitor. If it is not in evidence it cannot be displayed to the jury, it can only be deployed to the witness and counsel and me. Once it is admitted, however, you can ask for it to be published and displayed to the jury. I don't know. There are two separate issues here, one is connecting to the system. I certainly don't have the appropriate wires but I want to make sure that you do but that's something that hopefully you and standby counsel can sort out and get sorted out before tomorrow.

Second, who is going to operate the machine while you are conducting an examination. I mean, I would hope and assume

that standby counsel could do that or figure out someone who might be able to assist you in doing that. The alternative is for you to be able to do it yourself by going back and forth but there is only so much of that I can tolerate because that's justs going to make cross-examination intolerably long.

(Continued on next page)

MR. SCHULTE: My hope was that I wanted to be able to do it both myself. I think they're looking to see if there's a cable long enough that I can just bring the laptop here, pull up the exhibits as I do the cross. So obviously I'm not going back and forth. But I just wanted to check and make sure that the Court would be OK with us getting wires for that, or then if that doesn't work, for me to be here as I'm doing the cross.

I anticipated that I will be pulling the exhibits up as I'm doing the cross, and I just wanted to make sure that this is acceptable and that we can try and get a wire that runs across the floor. I mean I know it's a different courtroom but at the same time a setup so that I can do both.

THE COURT: If you are able to procure a wire and we can do it in a way that would render it safe and convenient to do it that way, I'm certainly open to it.

The other option is if the wire can only reach to the end of counsel table and there isn't too much of it, I could allow you to just go back and forth when you want to call up an exhibit. But my strong preference is that if we can't rig it and wire it so that you can take your laptop to the podium, then standby counsel, at your direction, can call something up. That does not intrude on your conducting your defense. Just as government counsel, I assume, will call upon their paralegal to call up an exhibit at the appropriate time, you'd say, I'll ask standby counsel to please show Defendant's Exhibit 1, and they

can then follow it up. There's no reason that you need to be the one that does that, and if it requires you going back and forth between the podium and counsel table, that's just not going to work.

Again, if you can procure a wire that's long enough and reaches and do it that way, that's great. Let's do it that way, and if it's based on the podium and is convenient, I think that I'm OK with that, assuming it doesn't pose problems. But if not, I think the best solution is going to be for counsel to do it at your direction, or if it's only a few instances, then you might be able to go back and forth, but that can't be an every-question sort of thing.

MR. SCHULTE: OK.

And so then my last question was just if there's any way that the Court can check in with MDC so that tomorrow when I leave I have my cross, opening, everything updated and printed, so that I can print it before I leave the MDC, just to make sure I have paper copies of everything.

THE COURT: I will certainly do my best.

MR. SCHULTE: Thank you.

THE COURT: Government, which of you intends to open?

MR. DENTON: I will, your Honor.

THE COURT: And do you have any prediction of how long your opening will be?

MR. DENTON: 20 minutes, tops, maybe a little less.

THE COURT: OK.

Mr. Schulte, do you anticipate giving an opening statement?

MR. SCHULTE: Yes, I do.

THE COURT: How long do you predict yours would be?

MR. SCHULTE: About the same.

THE COURT: All right. Very good.

We'll pick up where we left off with the jury selection. I assume that we'll be done with that at some point in the morning, hopefully not too late. And we'll then need to reconvene in 15A, and I'll give preliminary instructions. So I would assume that you will be opening tomorrow and starting with witnesses. That's certainly what I would expect if I were in your shoes.

I would hope that the government can give me a report in the morning on the 6(c) issues. If we need to reconvene in a classified setting, then we can make appropriate arrangements for that to happen at some point tomorrow.

Anything else that we need to discuss before we break for the day?

MR. DENTON: Just two, your Honor.

First, on the point the defendant was making about the exhibits, I think technically one of the reasons why we typically keep the laptops down at the end of counsel table is because that is where the sort of separate device that controls

the publishing goes. I think that's something we would have a little concern about Mr. Schulte trying to run from the witness stand — from witness podium, but we just wanted to flag that that's a separate piece that has to be addressed here so that things are not shown to the jury that are not in evidence.

I think the second thing with respect to that is it may be worth taking up tomorrow together with our report on the 6(c), but just whether it makes sense to have argument, briefing, or both, with respect to the government's objections to various defense exhibits that have been produced to us now.

THE COURT: All right. Is now not the time to discuss any of those?

MR. DENTON: We understand Mr. Schulte's got an updated set of exhibits for us. And so once we're able to get those, we'll take a look, and we can certainly either let the Court know what we expect in the morning or just come right out and have a plan for it.

THE COURT: Great. So definitely think about it. I certainly want those issues raised in a timely fashion so that we're not having argument when the jury's sitting in the box.

MR. DENTON: Understood, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

Mr. Schulte, anything remaining for you? Otherwise, we'll call it quits for the evening.

MR. SCHULTE: No, nothing further.

THE COURT: All right. I want everyone in here by nine so that we can take up whatever issues we have as the jury's coming together. I trust that while I told them to be here by nine, not everyone will be here promptly at nine, so we'll have a few minutes. The bottom line is I'll see you at nine tomorrow morning.

Have a good evening.

(Adjourned to June 14, 2022, at 9:00 a.m.)